

David Stebbins (pro se Plaintiff) 123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D, Harrison, AR 72601  
(870) 212-4947 acerthorn@yahoo.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID STEBBINS,

PLAINTIFF

VS.

Case 3:24-cv-03727-LB

JOHN DOE, d.b.a. CREETOSIS

DEFENDANTS

**MOTION TO CLARIFY**

Comes now, pro se Plaintiff David Stebbins, who hereby submits the following Motion to Clarify in the above-styled action.

1. On June 26, 2024, the Court entered a text-only order stating “The court was not aware of the vexatious-litigant order and withdraws its authorization of service.” See Dkt. 10.

2. It is unclear exactly what this means, and I hope the Court can answer the following questions so I know exactly where I stand.

(a) First, does the Court blame me for this mix-up, even though, as I explained, I still attached the order and letter and it was the Clerk, not me, who filed it incorrectly? And will I be punished for it?

(b) Second, what exactly did the Court mean when it said it withdraws its “authorization of service?” What “service” did it previously authorize? I recall the Court saying that it would “address the issuance of the summons and service in a separate order,” (Dkt. 6), but YouTube's lawyers swooped in before it got the chance to do that. So what, exactly, is the Court withdrawing?

(c) Third, where do we go from here? Will the case be sent to the duty judge? If so, does that mean a miscellaneous case number is going to be opened up? If so, can you please tell me the case number for that miscellaneous case so I can request ECF access in it? If the case is not to be given a new, miscellaneous case number, then what is the next step?

3. I am willing to follow whatever reasonable and non-oppressive plan the Court comes up with. I just need to be told what I need to do.

4. Wherefore, premises considered, I respectfully pray that this motion to clarify be granted.  
So requested on this, the 28<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2024.

/s/ David Stebbins  
David Stebbins